

United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge	Samuel Der-Yeghiayan	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge	
CASE NUMBER	10 C 5999	DATE	11/9/2011
CASE TITLE	United States of America vs. Shaun Chaney (#40040-424)		

DOCKET ENTRY TEXT

For the reasons stated below, Defendant's motion for an extension of time to file instanter a motion for reconsideration [6] is denied.

■ [For further details see text below.]

Docketing to mail notices.

STATEMENT

This matter is before the court on Shaun Chaney's (Chaney) *pro se* motion for an extension of time to file instanter a motion for reconsideration. Chaney pled guilty in case number 08 CR 108 to Count Four of the indictment, which charged Chaney with devising, attempting to devise, and participating in a scheme to use a wire in interstate commerce to obtain money and property owned by and under the custody of banks and lenders, by means of materially false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, and promises, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1343. On March 31, 2009, Chaney was sentenced to 84 months imprisonment. Chaney then brought a motion to vacate, set aside, or correct his sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (Section 2255). The Section 2255 motion was denied on December 8, 2010. On June 27, 2011, Chaney filed the instant motion for an extension of time to file instanter a motion for reconsideration. Chaney merely filed the instant motion on the docket and did not notice up the motion before this court as required by court rules. In addition, although Chaney contends that

STATEMENT

he was confused regarding his filings in his criminal and civil case, Chaney has not provided sufficient justification for waiting over six months to file a motion for reconsideration. Therefore, the motion for an extension of time to file instanter a motion for reconsideration is denied. The court also notes that the court takes into consideration the arguments on the merits presented in the motion for reconsideration, which is attached to the motion for an extension, and Chaney has not shown that the court erred in denying his Section 2255 motion.